

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY
AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD**

2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350
Sacramento, CA 95833
(916) 274-5721
FAX (916) 274-5743
www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb



**NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING/PUBLIC HEARING/BUSINESS MEETING
OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD
AND NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO TITLE 8
OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS**

Pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.4 and the provisions of Labor Code Sections 142.1, 142.2, 142.3, 142.4, and 144.6, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board of the State of California has set the time and place for a Public Meeting, Public Hearing, and Business Meeting:

PUBLIC MEETING: On **September 15, 2005**, at 10:00 a.m.
in the Auditorium, Room 102 of the Office Building 9,
744 P Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

At the Public Meeting, the Board will make time available to receive comments or proposals from interested persons on any item concerning occupational safety and health.

PUBLIC HEARING: On **September 15, 2005**, following the Public Meeting
in the Auditorium, Room 102 of the Office Building 9,
744 P Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

At the Public Hearing, the Board will consider the public testimony on the proposed changes to occupational safety and health standards in Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations.

BUSINESS MEETING: On **September 15, 2005**, following the Public Hearing
in the Auditorium, Room 102 of the Office Building 9,
744 P Street, Sacramento, California 95814.

At the Business Meeting, the Board will conduct its monthly business.

The meeting facilities and restrooms are accessible to the physically disabled. Requests for accommodations for the disabled (assistive listening device, sign language interpreters, etc.) should be made to the Board office no later than 10 working days prior to the day of the meeting. If Paratransit services are needed, please contact the Paratransit office nearest you.

**OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
STANDARDS BOARD**

STEVEN L. RANK, Chairman

NOTICE OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO TITLE 8
OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
BY THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD

Notice is hereby given pursuant to Government Code Section 11346.4 and Labor Code Sections 142.1, 142.4 and 144.5, that the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board pursuant to the authority granted by Labor Code Section 142.3, and to implement Labor Code Section 142.3, will consider the following proposed revisions to Title 8, General Industry Safety Orders, as indicated below, at its Public Hearing on **September 15, 2005**.

1. TITLE 8: GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS
 Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 107
 Section 5154.1
 [Ventilation Requirements for Laboratory-Type Hood Operations](#)

2. TITLE 8: GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS
 Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 107
 Section 5155
 [Airborne Contaminants](#)

A description of the proposed changes are as follows:

1. **TITLE 8: GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS**
Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 107
Section 5154.1
Ventilation Requirements for Laboratory-Type Hood Operations

INFORMATIVE DIGEST OF PROPOSED ACTION/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Existing Section 5154.1, Ventilation Requirements for Laboratory-Type Hood Operations, provides minimum requirements for the protection of employees when laboratory-type hoods are used to prevent harmful exposure to toxic material. Section 5154.1 specifies minimum ventilation and performance requirements, limitations on the use of laboratory-type hoods, and several specific requirements related to concentrations of flammable materials in the hood and duct, hazards associated with the exhaust stack, blowers, biological contaminants, use with perchloric acid, placarding of deficient hoods, devices used to indicate airflow, and a requirement that the inward flow into the hood be demonstrated.

The objectives of the proposed revisions to Section 5154.1 are to improve the performance of laboratory-type fume hoods when they are used to control harmful exposure to toxic materials or reduce the potential risk of fire and explosion. Labor Code Section 144.6 requires the Board to adopt standards for toxic materials that assure that no employee suffers material impairment or loss of functional capacity from exposure to such materials. Laboratory-type hoods are used to control the extent to which employees are exposed to toxic materials and the risk of fire and explosion. Section 5154.1 is intended to place requirements on the use and performance of laboratory-type hoods that make the hoods effective as devices to control these hazards. Other changes are proposed that will clarify existing requirements, but not substantively change them.

Changes are proposed to the current definitions of the terms “hazardous substance” and “laboratory-type hood” in subsection (b). The change to the term “hazardous substance” is intended to clarify that hazardous substances are those likely to cause injury or illness if not used with effective control methods, and not substantively alter the meaning of the term. The term “laboratory-type hood” is changed to indicate that laboratory-type hoods are used to control exposure to hazardous substances as compared with the current description as a device in which hazardous substances are used. This change is intended to make the definition of laboratory-type hood consistent with the change to the term “hazardous substance.”

Subsection (c), Ventilation Rates, is changed by adding an option to operate the laboratory-type hood at a reduced average face velocity of 60 feet per minute (fpm) if the hood is not being accessed by an operator and other specified conditions are met. The effect of this change will be to provide a reduced ventilation rate while not compromising the ability of the laboratory-type hood to contain the hazardous substances in the hood. A non-substantive change is also proposed to change the current velocity units from “linear feet per minute” to “feet per minute.” This change will make the velocity unit consistent with the units used in other ventilation standards.

The requirement in subsection (e)(2) to install sash closure restrictions is changed to permit hoods to operate without a permanent sash stop, provided other openings into the hood, such as the space under

an airfoil, are sufficient to ventilate the hood for explosion control. The effect of this change will be to eliminate the need for installing unnecessary sash stops in these cases.

The requirements in subsection (e)(3) are changed by replacing the current requirement for a continuous qualitative airflow indicator to a requirement for a continuous quantitative monitor. The requirement for a periodic inward airflow demonstration is also changed to require that it be conducted on an annual basis, as well as at installation, repairs or renovation, and the addition of large equipment into the hood. The change includes an exception permitting biannual airflow demonstration and velocity measurement if a calibration and maintenance program is in place for the quantitative airflow monitor or alarm system. The effect of this change will be to provide the hood user with a means of detecting changes in the airflow into the hood which cannot be detected with qualitative indicators and can cause significant reduction in the ability of the hood to control harmful exposure. The effect of the requirement for a specific procedure to demonstrate inward airflow on an annual basis will be to improve the reliability of the airflow demonstration to detect hoods with inadequate capture and containment characteristics initially and over time.

The requirement in subsection (e)(7) specifying construction materials is changed to include references to more recent polymer materials which are suitable for construction of laboratory-hoods that are used in perchloric acid evaporation processes. This change is not intended to substantively alter the current requirement. The effect of this change is to reduce uncertainty when these more recent materials are used.

The proposal adds a new subsection regarding hood operator qualifications. The subsection requires that employers take steps to ensure that employees understand the functional characteristics of the hood and are trained to use the hood safely. The subsection requires that the employees be familiar with the performance testing requirements for the hood and can determine when the hood was last tested. The effect of this change will be to reduce the risk that (1) employees use laboratory-type hoods in an unsafe manner, (2) the employee is unaware that required performance tests have not been performed, and (3) the hood is currently operating in an unsafe manner.

These amendments to Title 8 CCR Section 5154.1 are proposed pursuant the authority granted to the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board in Labor Code Section 142.3.

DOCUMENTS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

- Section 7, Tracer Gas Test Procedure, American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers, Inc., ANSI/ASHRAE 110-1995, Method of Testing Performance of Laboratory Fume Hoods.

This document is too cumbersome or impractical to publish in Title 8. Therefore, it is proposed to incorporate the document by reference. A copy of this document is available for review Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Standards Board Office located at 2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350, Sacramento, California.

COST ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED ACTION

Costs or Savings to State Agencies

Overall it is anticipated that the proposal would have no net costs and would allow state agencies and employers that use lab hoods to incur a significant savings. The proposal would require insignificant to no costs to be incurred for existing lab hoods. These costs would be more than offset by the significant energy savings that some agencies and employers may voluntarily take advantage of when under the proposal their lab hoods could be fitted with an automatic airflow control system that would reduce the airflow when the hood is unoccupied.

Based on information provided by the petitioner, it is estimated that roughly 85,000 hoods are in operation in California. Approximately 35% of these hoods are in state facilities, most of which are UC/CSU campuses. Another 35% of these hoods are located at community colleges, water quality laboratories, and high schools. The remaining 30% are located in the private sector, namely schools and biotech, chemical, or pharmaceutical companies.

Regarding the voluntary or permissive requirements of reducing the airflow into the lab hood as proposed in subsection (e)(2), significant cost savings can be realized if laboratory hoods are fitted with automatic airflow control systems as allowed by the proposed amendments. Assuming each lab hood consumes an average of 1,000 CFM and each CFM of single-pass air costs up to \$5 per year, each lab hood has an annual energy cost of \$5,000. It is estimated by the petitioner that lab hoods operated under this proposal could reduce energy airflow by 30-40% realizing an annual savings up to \$2,000. During the first year, this savings is likely to offset or exceed the initial installation, testing and recordkeeping expenses associated with the proposal since the petitioner knows of at least 2,000 lab hoods that are currently equipped with the technology and would take advantage of these energy savings once the standard becomes effective resulting in a minimum \$4 million savings in the first year. Thereafter, energy cost savings will continue up to \$2,000 per year for the thousands of hoods expected to take advantage of these significant energy savings. Based on these estimates, California public and private sector workplaces that utilize these setback type lab hoods would have an overall savings in the millions of dollars per year in energy costs.

The petitioner states that nearly all hoods installed within the past 10 to 15 years have quantitative airflow monitors or alarm systems that meet the proposed requirement in subsection (e)(3). The petitioner did a phone survey of state lab facilities and estimates that greater than 85% of those facilities already have monitors installed. Projecting that estimate to all hoods, less than 13,000 hoods would be affected by the requirement to install a quantitative monitor. Given that the average hood has an estimated lifespan of about 20 years, it is believed that this small percentage of older hoods would even be smaller when the proposal eventually phases into effect. Based on data provided by advisory committee members, it is estimated that the average one-time cost is approximately \$221 for the monitor or alarm system, including installation. Using the 13,000 older hood estimate, the total statewide estimated cost would be less than \$3 million. This cost is insignificant relative to the overall cost of hoods, along with operation and maintenance costs. A basic hood costs around \$5,000, and energy costs used to run the hood are approximately \$5,000 a year. Additionally, there are labor and administrative costs associated with operating and maintaining the hood. Thus the cost of a quantitative airflow monitor or alarm system are insignificant in comparison and would be offset should employers take advantage of the automatic airflow control system, permitted in the proposal, which would reduce the amount of airflow into the hood when the hood is unoccupied.

Most employers are already complying with the proposed amendments to subsection (e)(3) that would require qualitative airflow measurements be performed annually. This measurement/test is already required upon installation, after repairs/renovations, or the addition of large equipment into the hood. An exception to this annual measurement/test is included, reducing the frequency to every two years if a calibration and maintenance program is in place for the quantitative airflow monitor or alarm system. If there are employers who are not already conducting such tests, the extra cost associated with this additional testing requirement averages approximately \$82, including equipment and labor. It should be noted that annual testing of a hood's ventilation rate is already required under Section 5143(a)(5). The requirement to measure the hoods ability to maintain an inward airflow at all openings of the hood on an annual basis in Section 5154.1(e)(3) could easily, and cost effectively, be incorporated into the already required annual test of ventilation rates. Therefore, it is estimated that this \$82 annual cost is already being performed to comply with existing Title 8 requirements, manufacturer recommendations and national consensus standards.

The added training requirements prescribed in new subsection (f) of the proposal are not anticipated to add any additional costs to employers, as similar or closely related training would already be required under the employer's Injury Illness and Prevention Program specified in Section 3203 of the General Industry Safety Orders.

Impact on Housing Costs

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not significantly affect housing costs.

Impact on Businesses

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not result in a significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

Cost Impact on Private Persons or Businesses

See "Costs or Savings to State Agencies."

Costs or Savings in Federal Funding to the State

The proposal will not result in costs or savings in federal funding to the state.

Costs or Savings to Local Agencies or School Districts Required to be Reimbursed

No costs to local agencies or school districts are required to be reimbursed. See explanation under "Determination of Mandate."

Other Nondiscretionary Costs or Savings Imposed on Local Agencies

See "Costs or Savings to State Agencies."

DETERMINATION OF MANDATE

The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board has determined that the proposed standard does not impose a mandate requiring reimbursement by the state pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code because the proposed amendment will not require local agencies or school district to incur additional costs in complying with the proposal. Furthermore, this regulation does not constitute a “new program or higher level of service of an existing program with the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.”

The California Supreme Court has established that a “program” within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution is one which carries out the governmental function of providing services to the public, or which, to implement a state policy, imposes unique requirements on local governments and does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state. (County of Los Angeles v. State of California (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46.)

The proposed standard does not require local agencies to carry out the governmental function of providing services to the public. Rather, the standard requires local agencies to take certain steps to ensure the safety and health of their own employees only. Moreover, the proposed standard does not in any way require local agencies to administer the California Occupational Safety and Health program. (See City of Anaheim v. State of California (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1478.)

The proposed standard does not impose unique requirements on local government. All employers-state, local and private-will be required to comply with the prescribed standards.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

The Board has determined that the proposed amendment may affect small businesses. However, no economic impact is anticipated. See “Costs or Savings to State Agencies.”

ASSESSMENT

The adoption of the proposed amendments to this standard will neither create nor eliminate jobs in the State of California nor result in the elimination of existing businesses or create or expand businesses in the State of California.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Our Board must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Board or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Board would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

2. TITLE 8: GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS
Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 107
Section 5155
Airborne Contaminants

INFORMATIVE DIGEST OF PROPOSED ACTION/POLICY STATEMENT OVERVIEW

Section 5155, Airborne Contaminants, establishes minimum requirements for controlling employee exposure to specific airborne contaminants. This section specifies several types of airborne exposure limits, requirements for control of skin and eye contact, workplace environmental monitoring through measurement or calculation, and medical surveillance requirements. California periodically amends the airborne contaminants table (Table AC-1) in this standard to keep it consistent with current information regarding harmful effects of exposure to these substances and other new substances not listed. The standard was last revised in 2004. In this revision, the substances chosen for amendment were taken from the 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, and the 2001 editions of the Threshold Limit Values (TLVs) published by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH).

Some substances addressed in this proposal were originally included in a proposal heard by the Board at its December 18, 2003, public hearing. The Permissible Exposure Limits (PELs) for those substances were originally proposed to be below the ACGIH TLV. Because of employer and manufacturer concerns with the original proposals for the substances, they were withdrawn and considered at a special public meeting convened by the Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Division) on March 30, 2004. In some cases, the PELs originally proposed were changed based upon information received in this additional review.

This proposed rulemaking action also contains nonsubstantive, editorial, reformatting of subsections, and grammatical revisions. These nonsubstantive revisions are not all discussed in this Informative Digest. However, these proposed revisions are clearly indicated in the regulatory text in underline and strikeout format.

The exposure limits of the following substances are proposed to be lowered:

Acetone
Beryllium, and beryllium compounds as Be
2-Butoxyethanol
Crotonaldehyde (proposed to be lowered and changed to a Ceiling limit)
Epichlorohydrin
Glutaraldehyde
Hexachlorobenzene
Methyl bromide
Methyl 2-cyanoacrylate
Methyl methacrylate
Molybdenum, soluble compounds, as Mo
Propylene oxide

Exposure limits for the following substances are proposed to be added to Table AC-1 (new substances):

Bis (Dimethylaminoethyl) ether (DMAEE)
1-Hexene
1,3,5-Triglycidyl-s-triazinetriene
Vinylidene fluoride

A short-term exposure limit (STEL) is proposed to be added for the following substance in Table AC-1:

Methyl methacrylate

The short-term exposure limits are proposed to be deleted for the following substances in Table AC-1:

Beryllium (the text of the associated footnote is also proposed to be deleted)
Methyl 2-cyanoacrylate

Skin notations are proposed for:

Crotonaldehyde
n-Hexane

It is proposed to delete the Chemical Abstract Registry Number for coal tar pitch volatiles and to modify the footnote for coal tar pitch volatiles.

In addition to a proposed lowering of the PEL noted above, it is proposed to add two footnotes for glutaraldehyde.

The effect of these amendments is to reduce the risk of material impairment of health or functional capacity for employees exposed to the above substances.

All proposed changes to Section 5155 are considered at least as effective as or more stringent than the federal OSHA requirements in Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations (29 CFR) section 1910.1000, Airborne contaminants.

COST ESTIMATES OF PROPOSED ACTION

The subject proposal is a revision of an existing standard which specifies airborne exposure limits for chemical substances. The primary users of these substances are the private industrial and chemical sectors. The exposure limits proposed are consistent with recommendations of the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists or with scientific findings of which professional health and safety staff and consultants of these entities should be aware. Many of these entities already seek to control employee exposures to these levels in the interest of business continuity and minimization of tort and workers compensation liability. Therefore, the additional expenditures for these entities to comply with the revised standard are estimated to be insignificant to none.

Costs or Savings to State Agencies

No significant costs or savings to state agencies is anticipated to result as a consequence of the proposed action.

Impact on Housing Costs

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not significantly affect housing costs.

Impact on Businesses

The Board has made an initial determination that this proposal will not result in a significant, statewide adverse economic impact directly affecting businesses, including the ability of California businesses to compete with businesses in other states.

Cost Impact on Private Persons or Businesses

The Board is not aware of any cost impact that a representative private person or business would necessarily incur in reasonable compliance with the proposed action.

Costs or Savings in Federal Funding to the State

The proposal will not result in costs or savings in federal funding to the state.

Costs or Savings to Local Agencies or School Districts Required to be Reimbursed

No costs to local agencies or school districts are required to be reimbursed. See explanation under “Determination of Mandate.”

Other Nondiscretionary Costs or Savings Imposed on Local Agencies

This proposal does not impose significant nondiscretionary costs or savings on local agencies.

DETERMINATION OF MANDATE

The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board has determined that the proposed standard does not impose a local mandate. Therefore, reimbursement by the state is not required pursuant to Part 7 (commencing with Section 17500) of Division 4 of the Government Code because the proposed amendments will not require local agencies or school districts to incur additional costs in complying with the proposal. Furthermore, the standard does not constitute a “new program or higher level of service of an existing program within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution.”

The California Supreme Court has established that a “program” within the meaning of Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution is one which carries out the governmental function of providing services to the public, or which, to implement a state policy, imposes unique requirements on local governments and does not apply generally to all residents and entities in the state. (County of Los Angeles v. State of California (1987) 43 Cal.3d 46.)

The proposed standard does not require local agencies to carry out the governmental function of providing services to the public. Rather, the standard requires local agencies to take certain steps to ensure the safety and health of their own employees only. Moreover, the proposed standard does not in any way require local agencies to administer the California Occupational Safety and Health program. (See City of Anaheim v. State of California (1987) 189 Cal.App.3d 1478.)

The proposed standard does not impose unique requirements on local governments. All state, local and private employers will be required to comply with the prescribed standards.

EFFECT ON SMALL BUSINESSES

The Board has determined that the proposed amendments may affect small businesses. However, no significant adverse economic impact is anticipated.

ASSESSMENT

The adoption of the proposed amendments to this standard will neither create nor eliminate jobs in the State of California nor result in the elimination of existing businesses or create or expand businesses in the State of California.

REASONABLE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

Our Board must determine that no reasonable alternative considered by the Board or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the Board would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the action is proposed or would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed action.

A copy of the proposed changes in STRIKEOUT/UNDERLINE format is available upon request made to the Occupational Safety and Health Standard Board's Office, 2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350, Sacramento, CA 95833, (916) 274-5721. Copies will also be available at the Public Hearing.

An INITIAL STATEMENT OF REASONS containing a statement of the purpose and factual basis for the proposed actions, identification of the technical documents relied upon, and a description of any identified alternatives has been prepared and is available upon request from the Standards Board's Office.

Notice is also given that any interested person may present statements or arguments orally or in writing at the hearing on the proposed changes under consideration. It is requested, but not required, that written comments be submitted so that they are received no later than September 9, 2005. The official record of the rulemaking proceedings will be closed at the conclusion of the public hearing and written comments received after 5:00 p.m. on September 15, 2005, will not be considered by the Board unless the Board announces an extension of time in which to submit written comments. Written comments should be mailed to the address provided below or submitted by fax at (916) 274-5743 or e-mailed at oshsb@hq.dir.ca.gov. The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board may thereafter adopt the above proposal substantially as set forth without further notice.

The Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board's rulemaking file on the proposed actions including all the information upon which the proposals are based are open to public inspection Monday through Friday, from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at the Standards Board's Office, 2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350, Sacramento, CA 95833.

The full text of proposed changes, including any changes or modifications that may be made as a result of the public hearing, shall be available from the Executive Officer 15 days prior to the date on which the Standards Board adopts the proposed changes.

Inquiries concerning either the proposed administrative action or the substance of the proposed changes may be directed to Keith Umemoto, Executive Officer, or Michael Manieri, Principal Safety Engineer, at (916) 274-5721.

You can access the Board's notice and other materials associated with this proposal on the Standards Board's homepage/website address which is <http://www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb>. Once the Final Statement of Reasons is prepared, it may be obtained by accessing the Board's website or by calling the telephone number listed above.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
STANDARDS BOARD

STEVEN L. RANK, Chairman

NOTICE OF ADOPTION OF REGULATIONS
INTO TITLE 8, CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS
BY THE
OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD

After proceedings held in accordance with and pursuant to the authority vested in Sections 142, 142.3 and 142.4, of the Labor Code to implement, interpret, or make specific, the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, by a majority vote, adopted additions, revisions, or deletions to the California Code of Regulations as follows:

1. Title 8, Chapter 4, Subchapter 4, Construction Safety Orders, Article 24, Section 1670, Fall Arrest Free Fall Distance.

Heard at the March 17, 2005, Public Hearing; adopted on May 19, 2005; filed with the Secretary of State on June 15, 2005; and became effective on July 15, 2005.

2. Title 8, Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, General Industry Safety Orders, Article 25, Sections 3649 and 3651(a), Low Profile Tractors.

Heard at the March 17, 2005, Public Hearing; adopted on May 19, 2005; filed with the Secretary of State on June 20, 2005; and became effective on July 20, 2005.

3. Title 8, Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, General Industry Safety Orders, Article 19, Sections 3541-3546, 3548 and 3549, Automotive Lifts.

Heard at the August 19, 2004, Public Hearing; adopted on May 19, 2005; filed with the Secretary of State on June 28, 2005; and became effective on July 28, 2005.

A copy of these standards are available upon request from the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board, 2520 Venture Oaks Way, Suite 350, Sacramento, CA 95833, (916) 274-5721.

If you have Internet access, visit the Occupational Safety and Health Standards Board by going to: **<http://www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb>** and follow the links to the Standards Board. This information is updated monthly. The Standards Board's e-mail address is: **oshsb@dir.ca.gov**.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
STANDARDS BOARD

Keith Umemoto, Executive Officer